

### Remarks

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Arcykiewicz* in view of *Nelson*. The Examiner states that *Arcykiewicz* has each of the claimed elements except a first spring on an outer diameter of the sleeve, for which *Nelson* is supplied.

*Arcykiewicz* has a locking ring 22 from which the spring fingers 24 project outward. The locking ring is mounted upon the connector half 20 (sleeve) that is screwed into the threaded section 10 of the adapter 27 (body). The spring fingers 24 are outwardly biased, this outward bias freed for de-coupling purposes via a sliding coupling sleeve 21 with inner surfaces that engage the spring fingers 24, forcing them inward until the coupling sleeve is moved longitudinally, allowing the spring fingers 24 outward bias to return the spring fingers outward (col. 4, Ln 48-52).

Applicant respectfully submits that *Arcykiewicz* does not have spring fingers biased for an interference fit as claimed. As clearly shown in figures 1, 2 and 3 and described in paragraphs 22 and 23 of the specification, the spring fingers 7 are integral with a body 5, the spring fingers 7 biased to provide an interference fit over and against the outer diameter surface (the threads 3). The bias is provided via an inward projection of the spring fingers. Claims 1 and 12 have currently been amended to more clearly differentiate this bias from the externally

applied inward driving function of the coupling sleeve 21, used to overcome the outward bias of the *Arcykiewicz* spring fingers.

Also, *Arcykiewicz* does not have spring fingers integral with the body as claimed.

The spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* extend from a locking ring 22, not the body (coupler half 20 or adapter 27). The locking ring 22 is a spring metal stamped ring separate and distinct element from the body, having none of the structural attributes of a "body" as commonly understood in the electrical connector arts. Clearly differentiating the present invention from the cited art, the limitation that the body and spring fingers are integral has previously been added to claims 1 and 12.

Because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not biased via an inward projection to provide an interference fit upon the outer diameter surface, and or alternatively because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not integral with the body, each and every element of the invention fails to be disclosed, suggested or taught in the cited references. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Arcykiewicz* in view of *Nelson* and further in view of *Maury*. The Examiner supplies *Maury* as an example of an SMA or Type N connector with a second groove. As described in detail herein above, because the spring

fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not biased via an inward projection to provide an interference fit upon the outer diameter surface, and or alternatively because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not integral with the body, each and every element of the invention fails to be disclosed, suggested or taught in the cited references. Therefore, rejection of claims 6, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

Having obviated each of the Examiners rejections, applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Should the Examiner be inclined to issue an Official Action other than the notice of allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner first contact Applicant by telephone at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Andrew Babcock, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, PLLC  
PO Box 488  
4934 Wildwood Dr.  
Bridgman, MI 49106  
Telephone: 269.465.6603  
Fax: 269.465.6431

- Filed via EFS-Web, February 20, 2007 -